UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                          | FILING DATE                  | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/678,082                               | 10/06/2003                   | Jacobus M. Lemmens   | 091856-0105         | 4414             |
|  | 7590 02/27/200<br>ARDNER LLP | EXAMINER             |                     |                  |
| SUITE 500                                |                              |                      | SIMMONS, CHRIS E    |                  |
| 3000 K STREET NW<br>WASHINGTON, DC 20007 |                              |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|  |                              |                      | 1612                |                  |
|  |                              |                      |                     |                  |
|  |                              |                      | MAIL DATE           | DELIVERY MODE    |
|  |                              |                      | 02/27/2009          | PAPER            |

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. |                  | Applicant(s)   |  |
|-----------------|------------------|----------------|--|
|                 | 10/678,082       | LEMMENS ET AL. |  |
|                 | Examiner         | Art Unit       |  |
|                 | CHRIS E. SIMMONS | 1612           |  |

| before the rining of all Appear Brief  | Examiner   | Art Unit  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|
|  | CHRIS E. SIMMONS   | 1612  |  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe  | ears on the cover sheet with the c   | correspondence add  | ress                                     |  |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED 11 February 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS   | APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO  | R ALLOWANCE.  |  |  |  |  |
| The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| a) $\square$ The period for reply expires $\underline{3}$ months from the mailing date   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(  | MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL   | tension and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date. | of the fee. The appropria<br>nally set in the final Offic | ate extension fee<br>e action; or (2) as |  |  |  |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp   | liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be   | filed within two months                                   | s of the date of                         |  |  |  |
| filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| <u>AMENDMENTS</u>  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, by   |  |   | cause                                    |  |  |  |
| (a) They raise new issues that would require further col   | ,  | E below);   |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</li> <li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or</li> </ul>   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1  |  | ected claims.   |  |  |  |  |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12   | 1  | mpliant Amendment (                                       | PTOL-324).                               |  |  |  |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):  | :  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proving.</li> </ol>  |  | l be entered and an e                                     | xplanation of                            |  |  |  |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) objected to:  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>51-59</u> .  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu  | t before or on the date of filing a No   | otice of Anneal will not                                  | he entered                               |  |  |  |
| because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing<br/>entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o<br/>showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>   | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea  | ıl and/or appellant fail                                  | s to provide a                           |  |  |  |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation<br>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  | n of the status of the claims after er   | ntry is below or attach                                   | ed.                                      |  |  |  |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu   | t does NOT place the application in  | condition for allowan                                     | ce because:                              |  |  |  |
| 12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:   | (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)  |   |  |  |  |  |
| /Frederick Krass/  | /C. E. S./   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1612   | Examiner, Art Unit 1612  |   |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |   |  |  |  |  |

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant has proposed to amend claim 51 to recite the limitation a pH within the range of 5 to 6. This limitation was not previously considered in regard to the compositions of claims 51 to 55, and further analysis would be required to determine whether the compositions in claims 51-55, wherein said composition has a pH within a range of 5 to 6 and is not required to have a water content of 1.2 wt% or less, would have been obvious. Additionally a further search would also have to be made to determine the state of the art with regard to this issue, i.e., whether it would be obvious to have changed the pH of paroxetine compositions as more broadly recited in claim 51.